

Appln. No. 10/014,308
Amendment dated October 29, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed July 27, 2007

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 7, 13, 15 through 18, 20 through 27, 31, 34 and 35 remain in this application. Claims 8 through 12, 14, 19, 28 through 30, 32 and 33 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn. Claims 36 and 37 have been added.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

PART 2 - INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The information disclosure statement of November 13, 2001 has been objected to for not including a copy of WO 99/63458. The non-consideration of this document is acknowledged.

PART 3 - CLAIMS OBJECTIONS

Claim 27 has been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

Claim 27 has been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informalities in the language. Specifically, claim 27 has been amended to depend on independent claim 26.

Withdrawal of the objection to claim 27 is therefore respectfully requested.

PART 4 - 35 USC 112 REJECTION

Claims 1 through 7, 13, 15 through 18, 20, 21, 23 through 27, 34 and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite. (It is noted that although the rejection listed claims 1 through 13, claims 8 through 12 were previously cancelled.)

Appln. No. 10/014,308
Amendment dated October 29, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed July 27, 2007

The above amendments to the claims are believed to clarify the requirements of the rejected claims, especially the particular points identified in the Office Action.

Withdrawal of the §112 rejection of claims 1 through 7, 13, 15 through 18, 20, 21, 23 through 27, 34 and 35 is therefore respectfully requested.

PARTS 5 AND 6 – 35 USC 102(B) AND 35 USC 103(A) REJECTIONS

Claims 1 through 6, 13, 15 through 18, 34 and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cheng.

Claims 7, 20, 21, 23 through 27 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng in view of Kwon.

Claims 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng, Kwon and Petty.

Claim 1 requires, in part, "displaying on the display device a *graphical depiction which illustrates said more probable solution* to said fault condition in the connection on the display device" and "displaying of the display device a further graphical depiction which illustrates said less probable solution". Claim 13 requires "determine at least two possible solutions for correcting said fault condition, the at least two possible solutions including a primary solution being more probable for correcting said fault condition in the connection and a secondary solution being less probable for correcting said fault condition", "determine an appropriate *graphical depiction of said primary solution* to aid a user", "cause said graphical depiction to be displayed on said display device" and "if said detecting means detects said fault condition is present after display of said graphical description of said primary solution, determine a secondary solution for correcting the fault condition, determine a secondary graphical depiction which illustrates said secondary solution, and cause said secondary graphical depiction to be displayed on said display device".

Appln. No. 10/014,308
Amendment dated October 29, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed July 27, 2007

Claim 20 requires "determine a potential solution for correcting the fault condition", "determine an appropriate pictographical depiction of said potential solution to aid a user", "cause said pictographical depiction to be displayed on said display device", "if said detecting means detects said fault condition is present after display of said pictographical description of said potential solution determine another potential solution for correcting the fault condition", "determine another pictographical depiction which illustrates said further solution", and "cause said another pictographical depiction to be displayed on said display device". Claim 26 includes similar, but not identical, requirements.

Still further, new claim 36 requires that "the graphical depiction includes a pictorial depiction", which is clearly supported in the application and, for example, is shown in the depiction in Figure 4 of the drawings. New claim 37 requires that "the graphical depiction includes a depiction of a display device and a device capable of generating and transmitting a signal to the display device".

With respect to these requirements, it is stated in the rejection that:

With regard to claim 1, which further teaches (c) displaying on the display device a graphical depiction which illustrates said highly probable solution to said fault condition in the connection on the display device, Cheng further teaches, in column 4, lines 48-59, displaying on a monitor a graphical depiction of trouble shooting steps appropriate to the users fault to a user.

And it is further stated that:

With regard to claim 1, which further teaches (f) displaying of the display device a further graphical depiction which illustrates said further solution, Cheng further teaches, in column 4, lines 48-59, displaying on a monitor a graphical depiction of further trouble shooting steps to a user.

Looking to the Cheng patent, which is referred to at col. 4, lines 48 through 59, it is noted that the Cheng patent ends at col. 4, line 52, and does not reach line 59. Cheng states at vol. 4, lines 48 through 52 that:

Appl. No. 10/014,308
Amendment dated October 29, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed July 27, 2007

5. An interactive monitor trouble-shooting device as claimed in claim 1, further including means for activating a power saving mode when the horizontal and vertical synchronization signals are cut off during normal operation of the monitor.

It is not understood what in this portion of the Cheng patent discloses any "graphical depiction which illustrates [a] more probable solution to [a] fault condition". This portion of the Cheng patent is directed to a "power saving mode", and not to any depiction of a solution.

Further, it is submitted that the remainder of the Cheng patent fails to teach or suggest a graphical depiction. In contrast, the Cheng patent appears to clearly discuss the use of text, rather than any graphical depiction. See, for example, Cheng at col. 2, line 64 through col. 3, line 21 (emphasis added):

In accordance with another aspect of the present invention, the display of the trouble-shooting steps is incorporated with a monitor self-testing image to test the color display function of the monitor. An example of the self-testing image is illustrated in FIG. 2, wherein a plurality of words that demonstrate the trouble-shooting steps are displayed. The screen background of the testing image comprises the three elementary colors. For example, in the illustration of FIG. 2, the words "Self Test" has a blue (B) background; "Your monitor is" and "working" have a green (G) background; and "Check the Video" and "Cable and PC" have a red (R) background. All the words are in white color. If any of the three elementary colors is missed, then the user will be readily aware of the missing color. For example, if red is missing, then the background of "Check the Video" and "Cable and PC" disappears and all the words become light blue (the result of combination of blue and green); if green is missing, then the background of "Your monitor is" and "Working" disappears and all the words become pink (the result of combination of blue and red). This provides the user with a measure to check the color display function of the monitor. With this arrangement, the user may test the color display function of the monitor at the same when the trouble-shooting steps are followed to fix the problem of the monitor.

In light of the discussion that clearly sets forth that the "trouble-shooting steps" are set forth in words (as is also clearly illustrated in Figure 2 of Cheng) and not in "graphical depictions", "pictographical depictions",

Appln. No. 10/014,308
Amendment dated October 29, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed July 27, 2007

"pictorial depictions" which "illustrate [a] probable solution" as required by the various claims. Thus, it is submitted that Cheng makes it clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that the system displays "words", and not graphical depictions "which illustrate [a] probable solution". Even if one were to believe that the background display color was a "graphical depiction" (which it is submitted it is not), the background color still does not "illustrate [a] probable solution" which is required of the "graphical depiction" by the claims.

With respect to the allegedly obvious combination with Kwon, it is noted that the Cheng patent is directed providing verbal (word) instructions on a colored background intended to diagnose the presence or absence of various elements of the video signal, while the Kwon system lacks any verbal (word) instructions or any color diagnostic ability. It is submitted that while the Cheng system is directed to assisting in the diagnosis of a defective connection *after* the connection has been made, the Kwon system is merely directed to showing the connection process prior to connection, but has no ability to provide any of the diagnosis that is central to the Cheng system. It is therefore submitted that the allegedly obvious combination of Cheng and Kwon would not have been suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art.

It is therefore submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Cheng, Kwon, and Petty set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claims 7, 20, 26 and 31. Further, claims 21 through 25, which depend from claim 20 and claim 27, which depends from claim 26 also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Appln. No. 10/014,308
Amendment dated October 29, 2007
Reply to Office Action mailed July 27, 2007

Withdrawal of the §102(b) and 103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 7, 13, 15 through 18, 20 through 27, 31, 34 and 351 through 6, 13, 15 through 18, 34 and 35 is therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date: Oct. 29, 2007

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. 40,158
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357